

SN 10/790,283
P-2464/CIP

R E M A R K S

Reconsideration of the application is requested. Claims 1 through 5, 7, 8, 10 and 12 are now the only claims retained in the application.

Claims 6, 9 and 11 have been canceled.

The Examiner's objections to the Disclosure as set forth in paragraph 1 of the Examiner's action have been noted. Accordingly, the Disclosure has been amended so as to obviate each of the Examiner's noted objections thereto, as indicated in the foregoing amendments.

The informalities noted with respect to Claims 2 to 12 have also been noted. Accordingly, the claims retained in the application have been amended so as to obviate the noted informalities and to more particularly define Applicant's invention over the applied references.

Claim 1, which was rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Fahnestock, is noted. It has been well established that in order for a reference to anticipate an applicant's claim, the reference must disclose each and every feature set forth in the claim.

It is submitted that Claim 1, as now presented, is clearly not anticipated by Fahnestock. Clearly, the retainer ring 15 of Fahnestock is not supported on the shoulders 11 and 12 of

SN 10/790,283
P-2464/CIP

Fahnestock, as called for in Claim 1 as now presented. It is clearly evident that the retainer ring 15 is disposed between the shoulders 11 and 12 and is supported on the annular section 13 between the shoulders 11 and 12. Reference is made to Col. 2, line 82, wherein Fahnestock expressly states "Mounted in the angular depression 13 between the shoulders 12 and 13 and substantially encompassing the body of the bushing is a spring locking or retaining device comprising a substantially circular collar member 15 having fingers 16 preferably integral therewith and extending in a direction generally coincident with the axis of the bushing itself." Therefore, Fahnestock does not show the retainer ring 15 being supported on shoulders 11 and 12.

Furthermore, Fahnestock does not disclose an arrangement whereby the tangs of the retainer ring are disposed above a recess so as to provide a relief space for the tang to facilitate the insertion of the connector through a knockout hole of an electric box to effect a snap fit. As noted in Col. 2, line 50 of Fahnestock, it is necessary that the retaining ring requires a freedom of motion or play between the shoulders 11 and 12 so as to allow some movement in order to compensate for the extended length of the fingers as the connector is being inserted through an aperture. Also, as noted in Fig. 3 of Fahnestock, there is no relief space provided for facilitating the insertion of the

SN 10/790,283
P-2464/CIP

connector through a knockout hole with a minimum amount of force.

Since Fahnestock doesn't provide for any such relief, a greater force is required to insert Fahnestock's connector through a knockout hole of an electric box. As Fahnestock does not disclose the retaining ring 15 as being supported directly on the shoulders 11 and 12, and as the placement of the retainer ring 15 directly on shoulders 11 and 12 is not practical or rendered obvious in the absence of Applicant's own disclosure, Fahnestock cannot anticipate Claim 1 under 35 USC 102(b).

It is therefore submitted that Claim 1 is both structurally and functionally quite different from that of Fahnestock's structure and function. Since Fahnestock does not disclose each and every feature as now defined in Claim 1, it is submitted that Claim 1, as amended, is not anticipated by Fahnestock.

The rejection of Claims 2, 3 and 6 through 8 under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by the O'Neil 5,266,050 patent is also noted.

Claim 2 has been amended to more particularly define Applicant's invention over the applied O'Neil reference. As amended, Claim 2 now more particularly defines the construction of the outlet end as having opposed arcuate portions interconnected by flattened portions wherein the external threads defining a groove between adjacent threads are formed on the

SN 10/790,283
P-2464/CIP

opposed arcuate portions of the outlet end only. Also, the snap fit retaining ring includes curvilinear portions complementing the arcuate portions of the outlet end and opposed planer portions complementing the flattened portions of the outlet end.

Clearly, the reference to O'Neil does not disclose a connector body having an outlet end as now specifically defined in Claim 2.

Claim 2 also includes a plurality of dimples forming a depression circumferentially spaced about the inner circumference of said curvilinear portion of said retaining ring that projects inwardly of the retaining ring whereby the dimples are arranged to project into the groove defined between the adjacent threads for prohibiting separation of the connector body from the retainer ring when secured to an electric box. The complementary flattened portions of the outlet end and the planer portions of the retainer ring prohibit any rotation between the retainer ring relative to the outlet end of the connector body.

Since the O'Neil '050 reference does not now disclose each and every feature as set forth in Claim 2, as amended herein, the O'Neil references cannot now anticipate the structure defined in Claim 2. It has been consistently held that a reference to anticipate must disclose each and every feature of Applicant's claim. It is to be noted that all the embodiments in the O'Neil '050 reference disclose a connector body having a cylindrical

SN 10/790,283
P-2464/CIP

outlet end supporting a retainer ring which is free to rotate about the circumference of the outlet end portion. Thus, there is no teaching or suggestion in O'Neil to motivate one skilled in the art to derive the structure as now defined in Claim 2.

Furthermore, as indicated with respect to Claim 1, the tangs 50 of O'Neil cannot be equated to the dimple depressions called for in Claim 2. The tangs are blanked out of the plane of the O'Neil retainer ring so as to project inwardly to mate with the grooves of the thread, necessitating that the retainer ring of O'Neil must be threaded onto the threaded end of the connector body.

Reference is made to Col. 7, lines 35 through 54. As is apparent, Applicant's depressions do not require threading the retaining ring onto the threaded surface of the connector body. Due to the complementary flattened portions of the retainer ring and the connector outlet end, the Applicant's retainer ring cannot be threaded onto the threaded outlet of the connector body. The dimples permit the retainer ring to be simply pressed onto the threaded end of the connector body whereby the dimples are ratcheted over the threads. Thus, the act of threading the retainer ring onto the threaded end of the O'Neil reference is completely eliminated by Applicant's structure. As a result, Applicant's structure greatly reduces the time and effort to effect the electrical connection over that disclosed in the

SN 10/790,283
P-2464/CIP

O'Neil reference. It is therefore submitted that Claim 2 clearly patentably defines over O'Neil.

Claims 3, 4 and 5 are rendered dependent upon Claim 2 as amended, and/or a claim dependent thereon, and therefore Claims 3, 4 and 5 are considered to be patentable over O'Neil for the same reasons dictating the patentability of Claim 2.

Claims 7 and 8, which have been rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by O'Neil, have been amended to more particularly define thereover. Claim 7, as amended, now calls for a snap fit retaining ring adapted for use on an electrical connector having externally threaded outlet end comprising a blank of spring metallic material having longitudinally extending edges and opposed end portions, which is formed to define a ring that includes opposed curvilinear portions and opposed planer or flattened portions interconnecting said opposed curvilinear portions. A plurality of tangs are spaced along the length of the blank and a plurality of longitudinally spaced dimples projecting inwardly of the ring are arranged so as to be disposed in the groove between the adjacent threads on the outlet end of the connector. Clearly, O'Neil does not disclose a ring having opposed curvilinear portions which are interconnected by opposed flattened portions and/or that include a plurality of spaced dimples projecting inwardly of the ring which are arranged to be

SN 10/790,283
P-2464/CIP

disposed between adjacent threads of the outlet end of a threaded connector. For reasons stated hereinabove, the tangs 50 of O'Neil are structurally and functionally radically different from Applicant's claimed dimples. Applicant's claimed ring construction is structurally different and achieves an entirely different result from that contemplated by the reference to O'Neil. Since O'Neil does not disclose each and every feature as set forth in Claims 7 and 8, as now amended, it is submitted that O'Neil cannot anticipate Applicant's claim structure under 35 USC 102(b).

Claims 9 and 11 have been canceled.

The rejection of Claim 4 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over the O'Neil '050 reference in view of Tinnerman is also noted. It appears that the Examiner admits that O'Neil lacks a compound curvature on tang 23. It is submitted that Tinnerman cannot supplement that which is lacking in O'Neil, namely the compound curvature of the tangs. Tinnerman, in Col. 2, lines 9 through 25, expressly states that the fastening device has a body 10 in the form of a split ring with yieldable arms 11 formed therefrom. Tinnerman further states that each arm "preferably has a portion thereof extending outwardly as at 12 and another portion extending inwardly as at 13, the inwardly extending portion being located adjacent the free end of the arm

SN 10/790,283
P-2464/CIP

whereby a shoulder is formed intermediate the ends of the arm. The arms are yieldable with respect to the body and normally tend to spring outwardly therefrom as a result of which, they are moved inwardly by engagement with the wall of the opening to which the fastener is passed and are then automatically moved outwardly to engage the article behind the opening, thereby resisting movement of the fastener in a reverse direction through the opening."

Referring to Fig. 2, which is taken through a section line of Fig. 2-2 on Fig. 1, it will be clearly evident that the arms 11 do not form a compound curvature in both the longitudinal and transverse directions. As clearly indicated in Figs. 1 and 2, the tangs or arms 11 are not transversely curved in the manner contemplated by Applicant's structure. Therefore, where Tinnerman lacks any disclosure, inference or suggestion of a tang having a compound curvature as contemplated by Applicant's claim structure, it is submitted that it cannot supplement that which is lacking in O'Neil. It is therefore submitted that Claim 4 patentably defines over the references cited.

The rejection of Claims 5 and 10 through 12 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness type double patenting is noted. It is submitted that the Examiner's rejection of Claims 5 and 10 through 12 under the judicially created doctrine

SN 10/790,283
P-2464/CIP

of obviousness type double patenting is not well taken. However, if the Examiner remains of the opinion that the rejection is proper in view of the amendments currently made herein, Applicant hereby submits a terminal disclaimer under 37 CFR 1.20(d).

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, reconsideration of the application is requested and a prompt notice of an allowance is earnestly solicited. The requisite terminal disclaimer fee and disclaimer is attached hereto.

Respectfully submitted,



ARTHUR T. FATTIBENE,
Attorney for Applicant
2480 Post Road
Southport, CT 06890
Reg. No. 17,804
Phone: 203-255-4400;
Fax: 203-259-0033